UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WALTER WATSON,

v.

No. 2:16-cv-1784-EFB P

Petitioner.

ORDER

R. DAVIS,

Respondent.

24

25

26

27

28

Petitioner is a state prisoner without counsel seeking a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. He challenges the May 27, 2015 decision of the California Board of Parole Hearings to deny him parole. Consequently, the instant petition is one for review of the execution of a sentence imposed by a California state court. See Rosas v. Nielsen, 428 F.3d 1229, 1232 (9th Cir. 2005) (denial of parole is "a decision regarding the execution of" a prison sentence.) As a general rule, "[t]he proper forum to challenge the execution of a sentence is the district where the prisoner is confined." Dunne v. Henman, 875 F.2d 244, 249 (9th Cir. 1989). Petitioner is incarcerated at San Quentin State Prison, County of Marin, which lies in the Northern District of California. See 28 U.S.C. § 84(a).

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C § 2241(d), courts in both the district of conviction and the district of confinement have concurrent jurisdiction over applications for habeas corpus filed by state prisoners. While petitioner was convicted in this district, for the reasons set forth *supra*, the

1	proper forum for the instant challenge is in the district of confinement. In the interest of justice,
2	this court may transfer this action "to any other district where it might have been brought." 28
3	U.S.C. § 1404(a). Therefore, in the interest of justice, this action will be transferred to the United
4	States District Court for the Northern District of California.
5	In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to
6	the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d); 28
7	U.S.C. § 1406(a).
8	DATED: August 4, 2016.
9	ÉĎMUND F. BRĚNNAN UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21 22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	